H 820

## Approved For Release 2002/05/06 : CIA RDP74-00399R00030009p004-2ary 16, 1970

arman	Mosher
arman ohnson, Calif.	Murphy, Ill.
ohnson, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
onas	Natcher
ones, N.C.	Nedzi
ones, Tenn.	Nelsen
Carth	Nix
<arth ⊄azen</arth 	Obey
kee Keith Kluczynski Koch Kuykendall	O'Hara
Keith	Olsen
luczynski	O'Neal, Ga.
Koch	O'Neill, Mass.
kuykendall	Passman
Kyľ ·	Patman
Kyros	Patten
Lången	Perkins
Latta	Philbin
Lloyd	Pickle
Lowenstein	Pike
McClory	Pirnie -
McClure	Poage
McDade	Podell
McDonald,	Poff
Mich.	Pollock
McEwen	Preyer, N.C.
McFall	Price, Ill.
McFall McMillan	Price, Ill. Price, Tex.
Macdonald,	Pryor, Ark.
Mass.	Pucinski
MacGregor	Purcell
Madden	Quillen
Mahon	Randall
Mailliard	Reid, Ill.
Mann	Reid, N.Y.
Marsh	Reifel
Martin	Reuss
Matsunaga	Rhodes
Mayne	Roberts
Meeds	Robison
Melcher	Roe
Meskill	Rogers, Colo
Michel	Rogers, Fla.
Mikva	Rooney, N.Y
Miller, Calif.	Rooney, Pa.
Miller, Ohio	Rosenthal
Mills	Rostenkowsl
Minish	Roth
Mink	Roybal
Minshall	Ruth
Mizell	Ryan
Mollohan	Sandman
Montgomery	Satterfield
Moorhead	Saylor
Morgan	Schadeberg
	NAYS—
	111410

Belcher

Cowger Denney

Dennis

Adair Adams

Albert

Anderson,

Tenn. Ashbrook

Ashley Aspinali

Berry

Bevill

Biaggi

Brock

Blanton

Blatnik

Button

Chisholm

Clay Conyers

Cramer

Culver Dawson Delaney

Devine

Diggs

Dwver

Fallon

Findley

Dickinson

Eckhardt

Eshleman

Brotzman Brown, Calif. Brown, Ohio

Buchanan Burton, Calif. Burton, Utah

Clawson, Del

Barrett Bell, Calif.

Hall

Foreman

Hammerschmidt Mize Rarick Scherle Sebelius

Fisher Ford, William D. Fraser Frelinghuysen Gallagher Gray Griffiths Gubser Hagan Halpern Hamilton Hanna Hansen, Wash. Harrington Hays Helstoski Henderson Jones, Ala. Kastenmeier King Kirwan Kleppe Landgrebe Landrum Leggett Lennon Long, La. Long, Md. Lujan Lukens McCarthy

McCloskey

McCulloch

McKneally

Mathias

Morse

May Monagan

Scheuer Schneebeli Schwengel Scott Shipley Sikes Sisk Slack Smith, Iowa Stafford Staggers Stanton Steed Stelger, Wis. Stephens Stratton Stuckey Sullivan Talcott Taylor Thompson, Ga. Thompson, N.J. Thomson, Wis. Tiernan Udall Ullman Van Deerlin Vander Jagt Vanik Vigorito Waggonner Waldie Wampler Watts Weicker Whalen Whalley White Whitehurst Whitten Widnall Williams Wilson, Bob Wolff Wright Wyatt Wylie Wyman Yatron Young Zion Zwach

> Skubitz Smith, N.Y. Snyder Steiger, Ariz. Winn

NOT VOTING-112

Morton Moss Myers
Nichols
O'Konski
Ottinger
Pelly Pepper Pettis Powell. Quie Railsback Rees Riegle Rivers Rodino
Rodino
Roudebush
Ruppe
St Germain
St. Onge
Smith, Calif. Springer Stokes Stubblefield Symington Taft Teague, Calif. Teague, Tex. Tunney Watkins Wiggins Wilson, Charles H. Wydler

Zablocki

So (two-thirds having voted in favor AMENDING thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Adair. Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Morton

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ashbrook. Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Roudebush. Mr. Fallon with Mr. McKneally.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Button.

Mr. Hays with Mr Brotzman. Mr. St Germain with Mr. Kleppe

Mr. Gray with Mr. Landgrebe Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Berry. Mr. Leggett with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Lukens. Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Adams with Mr. Burton of Utah. Mr. Henderson with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Wydler. Mr. Yates with Mr. McCloskey. Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Watson.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Wiggins. Mr. Culver with Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Fisher with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Hamilton with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Findley. Mr. Rivers with Mr. King.

Mr. Pepper with Mr Watkins.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. Nichols with Mrs. May

Mr. Moss with Mr. Mathias. Mr. Monagan with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Myers. Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Eshleman.

Mr. Blanton with Railsback.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. O'Konski. Mr. Hanna with Mr. Devine.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Pelly.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Fraser with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Stokes with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Clay with Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Pettis.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Hagan with Mr. Riegle.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Symington.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. DUNCAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TITLE 44, STATES CODE, TO FACILITATE THE DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT RECORDS AND TO ABOLISH THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PA-

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14300) to amend title 44, United States Code, to facilitate the disposal of Government records without sufficient value to warrant their continued preservation, to abolish the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14300

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 33 (relating to disposal of records) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 3303 thereof the following new section:

"§ 3303a. Examination by Administrator of General Services of lists and schedules of records lacking preservation value; disposal of records

"(a) The Administrator of General Services shall examine the lists and schedules submitted to him under section 3303 of this title. If the Administrator determines that any of the records listed in a list or schedule submitted to him do not, or will not after the lapse of the period specified, have sufficient administrative level records or other cient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their continued preserva-tion by the Government, he may—

(1) notify the agency to that effect; and "(2) empower the agency to dispose of those records in accordance with regulations promulgated under section 3302 of this title.

(b) Authorizations granted under schedules submitted to the Administrator under section 3303(3) of this title shall be permissive and not mandatory.

"(c) The Administrator may request ad-

vice and counsel from the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives with respect to the disposal of any particular records under this chapter whenever he considers

that—
"(1) those particular records may be of

special interest to the Congress; or

"(2) consultation with the Congress regarding the disposal of those particular records is in the public interest.

However, this subsection does not require the Administrator to request such advice and counsel as a regular procedure in the general disposal of records under this chapter.

(d) The Administrator shall make an annual report to the Congress concerning the disposal of records under this chapter, including general descriptions of the types of records disposed of and such other information as he considers appropriate to keep the Congress fully informed regarding the disposal of records under this chapter.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3308 (relating to disposal of similar records where prior disposal was authorized) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out "by Congress'

(b) Section 3309 (relating to preservation of claims of Government until settled in General Accounting Office) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out "under sections 3306–3308 of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "under this chapter".

(c) The following sections of chapter 33 of title 44, United States Code, are hereby repealed.

repealed:

I also assure my good friend, the genman from Iowa, that when this matcomes before the House, it will have the most careful scrutiny.

promise one other thing, that the ocommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation will continue its careful a utmy of the programs, and one of the grams we will be watching with great late is the program which we are now ationding.

Mr. GROSS. I have no desire to take more time on this bill, except to note that the Department which is west directly interested in this bill, the measurement of the Interior, is opposed it and asks that Congress enact a orear program at a cost of \$5 million. Mr. DINGELL I would just assure ay friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that it was the judgment of the subcommittee and the judgment of the full CHamittee that if we enact a 1-year extension, we might as well kill the bill, because very few of the States will be able to take advantage of it, which means the termination of many of the grams.

Mr. GROSS. This is the kind of proseein we have had in the past?

Mr. DINGELL, No; we have not. We have given aid to 2-, 3-, or even 4- or 3-year programs. Our committee does and believe in having 1-year programs, because it does not afford an adeimpe level of flexibility and opportunity plan efficiently to make anditures.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not give us an opportunity to make it 4 1 year program at \$5 million a year. Mr. DINGELL, I would be happy to my good friend, the gentleman rom Iowa sit with us, and if he has disendments to offer, I would be glad to iage him visit with us and offer them. Mr. GROSS. That would be after the last, would it not?

Mr. DINGELL. That is the best offer make

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve see balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 ensustes to the gentleman from Maryland We GARMATZ).

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, a vote to assend the Anadromous Fish Conservaluen Act is a vote for conservation. I have every Member of the House underand that and appreciates the fact that this set is essential to the pereservation h, much of our Nation's valuable fishery respires. Unless the act is extended. and unless these funds are made availanish then certain species of fish will forever disappear from the waters of our world It is unthinkable that this would be drawed to happen.

Some of the funds which the extension has act will make available will be word to protect the anadromous fish from avages of pollution, land filling, consettlemen projects and other man-made

3-4 Unis legislation will do more than and provide money. It is designed to provide an incentive for States to join acceptive in cooperative ventures to atless fishery problems that are common in large regional areas—instead of to State areas. In this way, larger,

more effective programs, involving multistate participation, can be successfully implemented.

The multistate venture is an activity that needs encouragement; it is an extremely important and essential requirement, if our national effort to save invaluable fisheries resources is to be successful. In the past, there has been a lack of coordination and a lack of metivation to share responsibility. This is both unfortunate and inequitable. Because of the nature of the anadromous fish-which lead migratory lives-many other areas besides those in which spawning occur benefit from the anadromous fish program.

As I said earlier, the legislation before us today is designed to stimulate musistate ventures. When two or more States agree to share the expenses of any given program, the Federal Government will contribute 60 percent of the total program cost—instead of the normal 50 percent of the total program cost—instead of the normal 50 percent of the cost of t cent, as in most matching fund programs. Also, the total cost to the States is reduced/as more States join the project. This 60-40 arrangement will, of course. only/apply to so-called basin are as. such as the Great Lakes, the Chesapeake Bay and other similar bodies of water the term "basin" would include rive s and their tributaries, lakes and other bodies of water as defined in the legalation

I might also mention that the anadromous fish program already has been met with gratifying response from 31 States. Every coastal area of our Nation has participated in this program, including the Great Lakes, the gull, and east and west coasts. Hawaii, and Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most importante bill, and I urge its rapid passage I and also hopeful that the Senate will hollow our example, so that the very worth proposals this legislation contains can le implemented as soon as possible.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speake: I would like to express my wholehearted support for extension and expansion of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act

There is no question in my mind that this act should be extended for it is one of the most successful pieces of Jegislation of its kind that has passed the Congress in recent years. Tremendous benefits have come from the relatively small amount of funds that have been put into the act since it first became law in 1965 Depleted fish stocks have been replenished as literally millions of anadromou fish have been added to the Nation's waters. Thousands upon thousands of sports fishermen are once asain returning to our rivers and streams to fishwith some reasonable expectation o catching something. Commercial fishing has been enhanced and millions more additional pounds of salmon and other anadromous fish are available for the tables of America.

The economic impact of this legislation in the 4 years it has been funded has been unexpectedly good. The \$15 million in Federal grants, together with matching State funds, have returned close to \$150 million to the economy Oregon and the other west coast States receive a sizable portion of the allocations but the benefits are certainly not limited to that area. In fact, I am a little envious of the return other regions are getting. A \$6 million total investment in the Great Lakes region, for example, has generated returns of over \$62 million to that region's economy. In all, 29 States have participated in this program with an average return of almost \$5 for every \$1 invested

Artificial propagation as well as research and conservation projects are essential to the survival and growth of the delicate anadromous fish for we have so disrupted and dirtied our waters that nature's methods no longer work. As we continue to clean up our rivers, streams and lakes in the years ahead, let us continue to replace the fish we have driven out. Continuation of this act will help.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.P. 1049, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 300, nays 19, not voting 112, as follows:

### [Roll No. 12]

YEAS--300 Abbitt Chamber ain Flowers Flynt Abernethy Chappell Clancy Addabbo Foley Alexander Clark Ford, Gerald R. Fountain Anderson, Clausen. Don H. Calif Frey Friedel Anderson, Ill. Cleveland Andrews, Ala. Cohelan Fulton, Pa. Fulton, Tenn. Andrews, N. Dak. Collier Collins Fuqua Annunzio Jolmer Galifianakis Arends Conable Conte Corbett Ayres Gaydes Baring Beall, Md. Getty Corman Giaimo Bennett Coughlin Gibbons Betts Crane Gilbert Goldwater Biester Cunningham Daddario Daniel, Va Bingham Gonzalez Blackburn Goodling Green Oreg. Daniels, N.J. Davis, Ga. Davis, Wis. Ce la Garza Dellenback Boggs Boland Green Pa. Bolling Griffin Grover Bow Brademas Gude Brasco Dent Haley Derwinski Brav Hanle: Brinkley Dingell Hansen, Idaho Harsha Brooks Donohue Broomfield Harve Brown, Mich. Eroyhill, N.C. Broyhill, Va. Dowdy Hastings Hathaway Downing Dulski Hawkins Burke, Fla. Burke, Mass. Duncan Hébert Hechler, W. Va Edmondson Edmondson Edwards, Ala. Edwards, Calif. Edwards, In. Eurleson, Tex Burlison, Mo. Heckler, Mass. Hicks Bush Hogan Byrne, Pa. Byrnes, Wis. Holifield Erlenborn Esch Evans, Colo. Cabell Caffery Hosmer Howard Hull Camp Evins, Ten 1. Farbstein Carev Hungate Carter Fascell Hunt Feighan Hutchinson Cederberg Celler Ichord

Jacobs

# February 16, 1970 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

(1) section 3304 (relating to lists and schedules of records lacking preservation value and their submission to Congress by the Administrator of General Services);

(2) section 3305 (relating to examination of lists and schedules by the joint congressional committee for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government and the report of that joint committee to the Congress);

(3) section 3306 (relating to disposal of records by agency heads upon notification by the Administrator of General Services of the action of the joint congressional com-

mittee); and

(4) section 3307 (relating to disposal of records upon failure of the joint congressional committee to act).

SEC. 3. The table of sections of chapter 33 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out-

"3304. Lists and schedules of records lacking preservation value; submission to Congress by Administrator of General Services.

"3305. Examination of lists and schedules by joint congressional committee and report to Congress.

"3306. Disposal of records by head of Government agency upon notification by Administrator of General Services of action by joint congressional committee.

"3307. Disposal of records upon failure of joint congressional committee to act."

and inserting in lieu thereof-

"3303a. Examination by Administrator of General Services of lists and schedules of records lacking preservation value; disposal of records.".

SEC. 4. Section 2909 (relating to retention of records) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking out "approved by Congress" wherever occurring therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Is a second demanded? Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself

such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14300, cosponsored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Pettis) Democratic and Republican members of the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers would amend various sections of title 44. United States Code, to facilitate the disposal of Government records without sufficient value to warrant their continued preservation, to abolish the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, and for other purposes.

This bill is designed to vest full authority in the General Services Administration for the disposal of useless executive papers, a function which has been within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee of the Disposition of Executive Papers since the Reorganization Act of 1946. The joint committee would be abolished under this act.

Under existing law various departments and agencies submit disposal recommendations to the General Services Administration. These are reviewed in GSA and in the National Archives where they are subject to adjustment. When agreement at the agency level is reached

on disposal requests, the material to be disposed of is catalogued and assigned a disposal schedule. This schedule in the form of a coded reference list of numbers is referred to the joint committee for appropriate attention. Members of the joint committee are called upon to approve this disposal schedule.

Briefly, the basis for this proposal lies in the fact that there are numerous Federal departments and agencies throughout the United States and, in fact, the world which are involved in varying degrees. It is virtually impossible for a congressional committee to maintain a realistic oversight over the disposal of executive papers because of the complexity, volume, and location of the various agencies and material concerned.

The bill proposes to authorize the General Services Administration in conjunction with the National Archives, to handle the matter at that level. The bill would retain a certain congressional oversight in that General Services Administration would be able to refer controversial matters to the House Administration Committee and to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee for mediation or settlement.

The joint committee, as authorized in the Reorganization Act and under the rules of the House is comprised of two House Members and two Senators. There is no chairman, no separate staff, and the committee has not formally met at least in the past 14 years. The paperwork involved in congressional authorization for the disposal of executive papers has always been handled by the staff of the Committee on House Administration. Under the existing arrangement, members of the joint committee are called upon to approve disposal lists and schedules about which they have no knowledge beyond the recommendation of the General Services Administration. Further, as pointed out earlier, it is impractical to attempt to develop a system which would give the joint committee members full background information on the disposal requests.

Both General Services Administration and the National Archives are in full support and recommend passage of H.R. 14300.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, what executive papers are covered? Does this cover the papers of a former President?

Mr. DENT. As long as they are executive records, it is my understanding they would come under that disposal plan.

Mr. GROSS, So it covers Presidential papers as well as papers of other executive officers, Cabinet officers of the Government?

Mr. DENT. When that particular agency which has jurisdiction over the papers requests that the material be disposed of, then the GSA makes its study and decides on the time for disposal of such papers. The move to dispose of the papers must originate within the department or agency that has jurisdiction.

Mr. GROSS. I did not suppose there were any Presidential papers left, for

any former President to dispose of. They all have libraries, and I understand they take everything that is loose and perhaps some of the stuff that is not loose when they leave office.

Will this have anything to do with a tax exemption or the appraisal of papers? Let me put the question this way: Do Presidents take a tax exemption on papers they turn over to libraries, either the library that bears their name or a university library?

Mr. DENT. I will yield to the chairman of the subcommittee to tell the gentleman what he thinks about that.

Mr. NEDZI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is really irrelevant to the issue. The point is that this subcommittee did not have anything to say about disposing of the papers anyway. We did not know what they were. I, as a member of that subcommittee, received a list of numbers from the executive department. When I made some inquiry as to what I was signing to be disposed of, nobody knew. It was at that point I decided that the subcommittee was performing an absolutely useless function.

It was the General Services Administration which reviews reports from the various departments, and that is not just Presidential papers but other papers, such as Defense Department papers. The Agricultural Department and all the executive departments submit lists of documents they feel should be disposed of to the General Services Administrator, who then authorizes their disposition subject to the signatures of the members of the Joint Committee on the disposition of Executive papers.

I felt that was a totally useless function.

Mr. GROSS. I would have to say, in view of the explanation given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Michigan, that it must be more than an exercise in futility to be confronted with a situation of this kind.

I can understand the reason for the legislation, but I am still curious about these Presidential papers and the papers of certain other executives of the Government.

Will this cover the papers of Members of Congress?

Mr. NEDZI. Congress is not an executive agency; no yet.
Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is right.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may con-

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. We are indebted to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Nedzi) and the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Pettis) for calling the attention of the Congress to the necessity for this bill.

I believe it is a rather unusual but a very encouraging sign, when we see Members appointed to a committee who can bring back to us the information that the committee serves no useful purpose and the recommendation that it be abolished. I hope this bill will set some kind of a precedent. Its passage will streamline operations and save tax dol-

Mr. Speaker, this bill—H.R. 14300—provides the House of Representatives with an opportunity to help streamline the procedures to handle the job of evaluating and disposing of useless excellive papers and at the same time eliminate a nonessential committee of Congress.

Creation of a Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers undoubtedly was based on sound enough reasoning originally. It was established to provide the machinery to make the final decisions as to the disposition of papers of the executive agencies and, by agreement, of the courts.

Under the present system the heads of the agencies of Government submit to the General Services Administration that, and schedules of records which they believe do not have sufficient value to warrant their retention. The Administration of the General Services Administration reviews the proposals and forwards to Congress the lists of records when he agrees that they are not of sufficient value to retain. The lists come to the joint committee for final approval authorizing disposal of the records.

As a practical matter, however, approval by the joint committee of proposals to dispose of records can be nothing more than perfunctory since it is impossible to review and evaluate even the smallest portion of the many hundreds and thousands of documents and records involved.

In essence, members of the joint committee are expected to sign lists authorizing the disposal of records when they have no information as to their content and as a practical matter no way to find out.

This bill would eliminate the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers and provide that the Administrator of General Services could empower the various agencies to dispose of the records in line with the regulations promutigated by GSA covering disposal of accords.

To assist the Administrator in carrying that this authority, the bill provides that it is considered that any particular eccords may be of special interest to Confices or consultation with Congress about the disposal of any particular records is in the public interest, he may request advice and counsel of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

Congressional oversight is also mainamed under the bill in that it provides that the Administrator of the General Services Administration would be remired to make an annual report to Concress concerning the disposal of records ander this bill, to include such information as the description of the type of records to be disposed of and other information deemed appropriate to keep Congress soily informed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the approach abodied in H.R. 14300 is reasonable and sound. It would eliminate a nonessential committee here in the Congress and would provide more efficient machinery within the executive branch to deal with

the problem of disposing of records, documents, and other materials which are determined to be no longer needed. I urge the House to support H.R. 14300.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentieman from Michigan (Mr. Nepzi).

(Mr. NEDZI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to thank the gentleman from Idaho for his support. In behalf of myself and the gentleman from California (Mr. Pettis) I would like to express our deep appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. Dent) for cooperating and sharing the same kinds of concerns that we had about this joint committee. Without his help this bill would not be on the floor today. I think all of us in the Congress should be grateful for his assistance.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14300 was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. Pettis) and myself and has as its purpose the abolition of the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

The bill would vest authority in the General Services Administration for the disposal of useless executive papers, a function under the nominal jurisdiction of the aforementioned joint committee since the Reorganization Act of 1946.

When Congressman Pettis and I were assigned as the House Members on this four-man joint committee we soon discovered that we had no meaningful role to play in the disposition of the mountains of executive papers which had been selected for elimination.

The established procedure calls for the head of each agency of the U.S. Government to submit to the Administrator of General Services a list of papers for disposition. The Administrator of General Services, in turn, forwards the list to Congress where it is passed on to the Joint Committee for perfunctory approval.

Each member of the joint committee merely affixes his signature to a sheet listing numbers and the names of departments with no other description. There is no chairman, no separate staff and no meetings. Indeed, I am told that the committee has not met in at least the past 14 years.

I believe that the General Services Administration can handle the matter in its entirety. However, our bill would retain some congressional oversight in that GSA would refer any controversial matters to the House Administration Committee and to the Senate Rules and Administration Committee for meditation or settlement.

The need to dispose of useless papers, film. X-rays, and so forth, is unquestioned. Disposal saves money and space. I do not think that it is practical to try to develop a system where the joint committee would get more deeply involved. The General Services Administration should be able to handle the job.

The history of Congress indicates a proliferation of committees, subcommittees, and joint committees, a proliferation that is rarely checked.

This is one small case where abolition of one small committee will be utterly painless.

I can assure you that this committee will never be missed.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER protempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14300, as amended.

The question was taken; and (twothirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TO INCREASE CRIMINAL PENALTIES UNDER SHERMAN ANTITRUST ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14116) to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Act of July 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 2091, as amended, are hereby further amended by striking out, in each section where it appears, the phrase "fine not exceeding fifty thousand dollars" and in each instance substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "fine not exceeding five hundred thousand dollars if a corporation or fifty thousand dollars if any other person."

The SPEAKER protempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a letter from the Attorney General.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14116 increases from \$50,000 to \$500,000 the maximum fine which may be imposed upon a corporation in a criminal suit for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act— 15 United States Code 1, 2, and 3. At the present time the maximum penalty which may be imposed upon conviction for each count of an indictment under the Sherman Act is a fine no: exceeding \$50,000. imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court. H.R. 14116 makes no charge in the penalties applicable to natural persons. The court will continue to exercise discretion in the imposition of punishment after consideration of the gravity and duration of the offense, its consequences upon the national economy, and the need to deter future practices of comparable nature.

When the Sherman Act was enacted in 1890, it provided for a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. Shortly thereafter there were complaints that the fine, the penalty applicable to proporate violators,